REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4 - 6, 10, 14, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is believed to be added by the amendments.

REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION

Applicant submits herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and respectfully requests entry and consideration of the present claims.

§103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/18066 to Bender et al. (hereinafter Bender) in view of the admitted prior art ("APA") as disclosed by the Applicant in the specification FIG. 1, page 1, lines 12-22. Further, on pages 2-3 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that:

Bender clearly discloses that "...the terminal unit 40, as well as the wireless modem 42, must be assigned an IP address so that each may be addressed individually within the system... in addition, the use of independent IP addresses allows the terminal equipment unit 40 and the wireless modem 42 to exchange IP messages intended for one another.

- Bender discloses that the terminal 40 and the wireless modem 42 are assigned IP address so that each may be addressed individually and can communicate to the network unit 58 over the wireless link.
- Bender discloses that both the terminal equipment unit 40 and the wireless modem 42 use their unique hardware address to request a separate IP address. Also it is well known in the art that a MAC address is a hardware address that uniquely identifies each node of a network.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Independent claims 1, 14, 15 and 16 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, determining a MAC address for the device and for the bridge device; and separately registering to the access point, with the respective MAC addresses, the device and itself as wireless devices on the wireless network, wherein the registration is performed through an authentication and an association process of the type as defined by the IEEE 802.11 standard.

The Examiner states on page 2 of the Advisory Action that "it is known for wireless networks to use IEEE 802.11 specification to allow stations on the wireless network to exchange data." This is indeed well known. However, this is not what is indicated in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16. In claims 1, 14, 15 and 16 the bridge device separately registers each device to the access point as a wireless device, i.e., with the association and authentication procedure of the IEEE 802.11 standard. Neither Bender nor the APA disclose or suggest such a registration process.

Again, the problem solved by Bender is to provide means for negotiating IP

addresses and to avoid the transmission of broadcast messages from the network link over a wireless link in order to conserve the bandwidth and capacity of the wireless link.

See page 5, lines 6-14.

In a first embodiment of Bender, described on page 11, lines 3-7, the wireless modem is pre-assigned an IP address for its own use, and another IP address is stored in a local server for assignment to the terminal equipment unit.

In a second embodiment, indicated on page 12, lines 15-22, the local server may store more than one permanent IP address. In addition, Bender states that its invention is also applicable to multiple terminal equipment units.

On page 9, lines 7-11, Bender states, "[B]efore the terminal equipment unit 40 can transmit or receive IP datagrams over the wireless link 56, the terminal equipment unit 40 as well as the wireless modern 42 must be assigned an IP address so that each may be addressed individually within the system."

However, Bender is completely silent with respect to any mention of using MAC addresses to separately register each device to an access point, essentially as claimed in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16. Instead, Bender is wholly based on IP address registrations. In contrast, the present invention is based on MAC address registrations. While Bender arguably mentions a permanent hardware address, note that in Bender any use of hardware addresses is simply for the purpose of assigning an IP address. This is NOT to be confused with registration of devices based on a MAC address. Indeed, Bender fails to disclose using 'hardware addresses' much less MAC addresses, for registering a device to an access point.

The admitted prior art "APA" as indicated in page 1 line 12-22 of the application fails to cure the deficiencies of Bender. Namely, the APA fails to disclose or suggest separately registering to the access point with the respective MAC addresses, the device and itself as wireless devices on the wireless network, wherein the registration is performed through an authentication and an association process of the type as defined by the IEEE 802.11 standard, essentially as claimed in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16.

Therefore, claims 1, 14, 15 and 16 are patentably distinguishable over Bender in view of the APA. Claims 2-13 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 1 and are thus believed to be allowable as well. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection in view of Bender and the APA is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of the claims set forth in the Final Office Action of January 8, 2008 be withdrawn, that pending Claims 1-16 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

Furthermore, Applicant submits a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) herewith.

In the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's representatives Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Paul Kiel

Registration No. 40,677

Mailing Address:

THOMSON LICENSING LLC PATENT OPERATIONS P.O. BOX 5312 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 5/30/08